

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14-21, 34, 44, and 46-50 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on September 16, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 34, 44, and 46-49 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 14, 16-18, 20, 21, 34, 44, and 46-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (US 5,555,346), Kelts (US 2001/0030667), Selker (US 6,549,219), and Nielsen (US 6,337,699). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reason. Gross, *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the features recited in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to providing an interactive user interface associated with one or more prioritized items that come from various external sources. The priorities are automatically determined by a prioritization system or may be provided by a user. To this end independent claim 1 recites ***a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority, the user interface provides feedback about one or more user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the one or more user actions comprising a time of response to the at least some of the one or more e-mails, reading the at least some of the one or more e-mails, deleting the at least some of the one or more e-mails or ignoring the at least some of the one or more e-mails, the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback received from the user interface about the one or more user actions relating to the e-mails***. Independent claims 34, 44 and 46 recite similar features. Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielson, either alone or in combination, fail to teach such claimed features.

Gross, *et al.* relates to an event driven and conditional rule based mail messaging system wherein a rule mechanism having a “When-If-Then” condition is implemented. A feedback

from the user interface triggers an event that invokes a rule. However, as conceded by the Examiner at page 3 of the Final Office Action, Gross *et al.* does not disclose a priorities system configured to adjust *the prioritization of one or more subsequently received emails* based on the feedback about the one or more user actions relating to the one or more emails. Rather, Gross *et al.* invokes the same rule for a specific event. The Examiner cites Kelts to cure the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*

Kelts relates to retrieving programming information and for generating an interactive navigation interface for displaying such programming information. A navigation interface utilizes a magnification feature along with a hierarchical protocol for the display of active map items and allows a user to make selections. At the cited portions of paragraph 0086, Kelts provides for displaying categories and subcategories in accordance with a suitable prioritization metric based on a user's frequency of selection, or specific preferences entered by a user or service provider. However, Kelts does not disclose the user interface providing feedback about one or more user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, *the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback received from the user interface about the one or more user actions relating to the one or more e-mails*. Rather, Kelts discloses prioritizing the order of displaying the one or more currently displayed items in a subsequent instance of map display, based on the feedback provided by the user interface in a prior instance of the map display for the currently displayed items. Thus, Kelts fails to teach or suggest classifying subsequently added stations based on user interaction with currently accessible stations. In contrast, the claimed invention provides for receiving a feedback from the user interface about one or more user actions relating to at least some of the currently received e-mails, and based on the feedback prioritizing the *one or more subsequently received e-mails*. Further at the cited portions of paragraph 0159, Kelts refers to a set-top device for a television that works like a general purpose computer to perform *additional software applications such as email applications*. However, Kelts is silent regarding representing emails as objects in a display element let alone prioritizing e-mails. Thus, the prioritization scheme as taught by Kelts, although responsive to use patterns or programming changes thus facilitates automatic changes of the navigation map, it only teaches applying such changes to existing information within the map and does not teach or suggest applying such changes to new information that is

subsequently added to the map. Thus, Kelts is silent regarding *a user interface that provides feedback about user actions relating to at least some of the one or more e-mails, the priorities system configured to adjust its decision making regarding the prioritization of one or more subsequently received e-mails based on the feedback received from the user interface about the one or more user actions relating to the e-mails* as recited by independent claim 1.

Selker relates to a graphical user interface that includes multiple pie menus concentrically arranged. The menus are arranged with menu selections of greater importance located within the centre most section. The first pie menu comprises a first group of items and the second menu comprises a second group of items. However, nowhere does Selker disclose *a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority*. Rather, Selker discloses wedges representing different menu items, and displaying the name of the menu item in the respective wedge. Nowhere does Selker disclose the wedges with one or more objects displayed in the wedges. In contrast, the claimed invention provides for a plurality of wedges with one or more object displayed on them, wherein the objects represent the one or more emails. Thus, Selker is silent regarding *a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority* as recited by independent claim 1, and also fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.* and Kelts. The Examiner cites Nielson to compensate for the deficiencies of Selker.

Nielson relates to a visual presentation of an icon such that a user can visualize and distinguish icons based on their context and can classify them as to importance. However, Nielson is silent regarding *a user interface that comprises a plurality of colored wedges with one or more objects displayed thereon, the wedges represent one of a user context or a source of the emails, the emails are represented by the one or more objects which are displayed based on an assigned priority* as recited by independent claim 1, and fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Selker. Further, Nielson also fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.* and Kelts with respect to independent claim 1.

In view of at least the foregoing it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 34, 44, 46 and all claims that depend there from.

II. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (US 5,555,346), Kelts (US 2001/0030667), Selker (US 6,549,219), Nielsen (US 6,337,699), and Knowlton *et al.* (US 6,057,842). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 15 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Knowlton relates to a visual link mechanism for identifying addresses of locations in a plurality of remote systems and does not remedy aforementioned deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (US 5,555,346), Kelts (US 2001/0030667), Selker (US 6,549,219), Nielsen (US 6,337,699), and Simonoff (US 6,078,322). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 19 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Simonoff relates to a virtual machine or device that facilitates interoperability between two or more computers but does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 50 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross (US 5,555,346), Kelts (US 2001/0030667), Selker (US 6,549,219), Nielsen (US 6,337,699), and Keller *et al.* (US 5,767,852). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 50 depends from claim 1 and as explained above, Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Keller relates to

a graphical user interface allowing users to alter the scheduling priority of one or more running processes represented by icons in the display. Keller teaches locking certain icons in place so that they do not move upon other icons being moved to the vicinity. Hence the position of such icons is procedurally specified by the underlying software as a function of priority and can only be changed by special privileges. Moreover, it requires that values be set for each icon in order to lock it in place. In contrast, the claimed subject matter provides a cover for the icons so that they are held in place by a single locking mechanism and it permits a user to easily reset priorities of the system via selection and drag operation. Such a single locking mechanism for all items is not taught or suggested by Keller. Moreover, Keller does not remedy the deficiencies of Gross *et al.*, Kelts, Selker and Nielsen with respect to independent claim 1 from which claim 50 depends. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP248US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731